

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 8. This sheet, which includes Figs. 8A, 8B and 8C, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 8.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

## REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1, 4-34 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 112. In addition, the Examiner has rejected claims 1, 4-23, 26-29 and 35-38 over 35 U.S.C. § 112 over U.S. Patent No. 7,228,492 B1 (“*Graham* ’492”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,495,795 B2 (“*Graham* ’795”) and has rejected claims 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) *Graham* ’492, in view of *Graham* ’795, and U.S. Patent No. 5,644,692 (*Eick*).

Undersigned thanks the Examiner for his through examination and granting the Applicant a first telephonic-interview on October 6, 2009. As proposed during the first telephonic-interview, the subject matter previously recited in claim 1 has been amended. However, it should be noted that the subject matter discussed during the telephonic-interview is now presented as a new claim, namely claim 45. The following remarks further summarize the substance of the telephonic-interview and fully traverse the Examiner’s rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The Examiner is also thanked for granting the Applicant a second telephonic-interview on November 24, 2009. As discussed during the telephonic-interview, a new claim 39 pertains to another aspect of the invention believed to also be patentable over the *cited art*. Pursuant to the Agreement reached with the Examiner regarding further clarifying this claimed aspect of the invention, the specification has been amended and a replacement sheet for Figure 8 is hereby submitted herewith for approval of the Examiner. The following remarks further summarize the substance of the second telephonic-interview.

As noted in the specification of the present application, “[t]he present invention enables a scroll bar to be displayed such that it provides indicators of the content or importance of the content of the file being viewed. This is accomplished, in part, through the use of one or more indicators such as color, hue, intensity, and/or degree of transparency. In this manner, a user may visually ascertain desired location(s) in the file by viewing the scroll bar” (Summary of the invention). With reference to FIG. 8 the specification also states that: “[e]ach row is represented by a granule object. Each granule object stores the row’s reference count, the linear row reference count, and the non-linear row reference count. In this manner, the processed file data is represented for use in displaying the scroll bar and associated file contents as the user scrolls through the file. Each granule object may also store the text of the row and associated color” (Specification, page 11-12).

New independent claims have been presented in a form to clearly recite that *a scroll bar can change its appearance based upon the relative importance of content of the file.*

More particularly, as a representative claim, claim 39 recites: “*changing the appearance of the scroll bar as the scroll bar is moved relative to the file, wherein the change in appearance of the scroll bar is based upon the determined relative importance of the desired locations in the file corresponding to a current position of the scroll bar.*”

It is respectfully submitted that the annotation contour 514 of *Graham* ‘492 does not change its appearance even assuming purely for the sake of argument that “[t]he annotation contour 514 including a sliding window 524 may be considered a scroll bar...,” as asserted by the Examiner in the Office Action (Office Action, page 6, citing Col. 6, line 65 to Col. 7, line 15 of *Graham* ‘492). Clearly, the appearance of contour 514 is static. As such, it is respectfully submitted that *Graham* ‘492 teaches away from a scroll bar that changes its appearance based on relative importance of content. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that *Graham* ‘492 cannot be combined with any other reference to teach the claimed feature.

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the *cited art* does not teach or suggest this claimed feature and Claim 39 and other new independent claims reciting similar features are therefore patentable over the *cited art* for at least this reason.

Again, it should be noted that the subject matter previously presented as claim 1 and discussed with the Examiner during the first telephonic interview is now presented as a new claim 21. As noted above, the Examiner has asserted in the Office Action that “[t]he annotation contour 514 including a sliding window 524 may be considered a scroll bar...” (Office Action, page 6, citing Col. 6, line 65 to Col. 7, line 15 of *Graham* ‘492). Furthermore, the Examiner has asserted that *Graham* ‘492 clearly indicates that the sliding window 524 may be displayed on either axis (Office Action, page 6, citing Col. 9, line 60 to Col. 10, line 3 of *Graham* ‘492).

Contrary to the Examiner’s assertion, it is respectfully submitted that *Graham* ‘492 does not teach that sliding window 524 may be displayed on either axis. In fact, *Graham* ‘492 depicts providing a conventional vertical scroll bar (504) and therefore teaches away from the claimed *vertical scroll bar in proximity of an edge of the displayed portion of the content*. As such, it is respectfully submitted that *Graham* ‘492 cannot be combined with any other reference to teach this claimed feature.

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the *cited art* does not teach or suggest:

*obtaining a plurality of desired rows in the file as a plurality of desired locations in the file; and*

*displaying a plurality of horizontal segments of the scroll bar at least partially based on one or more granule objects, wherein each one of the one or more granule objects is representative of one of the desired rows (Claim 45).*

Still Further, it is respectfully submitted that the *cited art* does not teach or suggest:

*displaying at least a portion of the file by applying the display criteria when the scroll bar is being displayed (Claim 45).*

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the cited art of record. Additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed because the limitations discussed above are sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited art. Accordingly, Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner.

Applicant hereby petitions for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 504481 (Order No. APL1P301). Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,  
BEYER LAW GROUP LLP

/RMahboubian/  
Ramin Mahboubian  
Reg. No. 44,890

P.O. Box 1687  
Cupertino, CA 95015-1687  
408-255-8001